

PROJECTIVE SPACE: POINTS AND PLANES

P.L. ROBINSON

ABSTRACT. We take points and planes as fundamental, lines as derived, in an axiomatic formulation of three-dimensional projective space, the self-dual nature of which formulation renders automatic the principle of duality.

INTRODUCTION

Traditional axiomatic approaches to three-dimensional projective space start from points and lines as fundamental elements and from them construct planes as derived elements. Accordingly, the *primary* notion ‘point’ and the *secondary* notion ‘plane’ are paired in the principle of duality, the proof of which thereby involves some slight awkwardness. In [R] we detailed an equivalent axiomatization that takes line alone as fundamental element, from which point and plane are derived in parallel: the principle of duality (which pairs the secondary notions) requires no proof, as the axioms are self-dual. Our purpose here is to pursue an alternative course that naturally presents itself: we take point and plane as fundamental, line as derived; again the axioms are self-dual, so the principle of duality (which pairs the primary notions) is automatic.

THE AXIOMATIC FORMULATION

We begin with a pair of disjoint nonempty sets: $\mathbf{P}$, whose elements we call points and denote by upper case Roman letters; $\mathbf{\Pi}$, whose elements we call planes and denote by lower case Greek letters. Between these sets we posit a relation $\#$ of incidence: when $P \in \mathbf{P}$ and $\pi \in \mathbf{\Pi}$ are incident, we write $P\#\pi$ and $\pi\#P$ indiscriminately, saying that P lies in π or that π passes through P ; we may also say that P is on π or that π is on P . Some additional notation will simplify the presentation of our axioms.

When $P \in \mathbf{P}$ we define

$$P^\# = \{\pi \in \mathbf{\Pi} : P\#\pi\}$$

and when $\pi \in \mathbf{\Pi}$ we define

$$\pi^\# = \{P \in \mathbf{P} : \pi\#P\}.$$

More generally, when $\mathbf{S} \subseteq \mathbf{P}$ we shall write

$$\mathbf{S}^\# = \{\pi \in \mathbf{\Pi} : (\forall P \in \mathbf{S}) P\#\pi\}$$

and when $\mathbf{\Sigma} \subseteq \mathbf{\Pi}$ we shall write

$$\mathbf{\Sigma}^\# = \{P \in \mathbf{P} : (\forall \pi \in \mathbf{\Sigma}) \pi\#P\}.$$

Further, it will be convenient to write $\mathbf{S}\#\mathbf{\Sigma}$ to mean that $P\#\pi$ whenever $P \in \mathbf{S}$ and $\pi \in \mathbf{\Sigma}$; for example, $\mathbf{S}\#\mathbf{S}^\#$ and $\mathbf{\Sigma}\#\mathbf{\Sigma}^\#$. By definition,

$$\mathbf{S} \subseteq \mathbf{\Sigma}^\# \Leftrightarrow \mathbf{S}\#\mathbf{\Sigma} \Leftrightarrow \mathbf{S}^\# \supseteq \mathbf{\Sigma}.$$

The incidence relation $\#$ satisfies the usual ‘Galois’ properties, among which are the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{S}_1 \subseteq \mathbf{S}_2 \subseteq \mathbf{P} &\Rightarrow \mathbf{S}_1^\# \supseteq \mathbf{S}_2^\# \\ \mathbf{\Sigma}_1 \subseteq \mathbf{\Sigma}_2 \subseteq \mathbf{\Pi} &\Rightarrow \mathbf{\Sigma}_1^\# \supseteq \mathbf{\Sigma}_2^\# \\ \mathbf{S} \subseteq \mathbf{P} &\Rightarrow \mathbf{S} \subseteq \mathbf{S}^{\#\#} \\ \mathbf{\Sigma} \subseteq \mathbf{\Pi} &\Rightarrow \mathbf{\Sigma} \subseteq \mathbf{\Sigma}^{\#\#}. \end{aligned}$$

We are now able to present our axioms for three-dimensional projective space, as follows.

AXIOM [1]

If $P \in \mathbf{P}$ then $P^\# \neq \mathbf{\Pi}$.

If $\pi \in \mathbf{\Pi}$ then $\pi^\# \neq \mathbf{P}$.

AXIOM [2]

If $A, B \in \mathbf{P}$ then $|\{A, B\}^\#| > 2$.

If $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbf{\Pi}$ then $|\{\alpha, \beta\}^\#| > 2$.

AXIOM [3]

If $A, B, C \in \mathbf{P}$ then $\{A, B, C\}^\# \neq \emptyset$.

If $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \mathbf{\Pi}$ then $\{\alpha, \beta, \gamma\}^\# \neq \emptyset$.

AXIOM [4]

Let $A \neq B$ in $\mathbf{P}$ and $\alpha \neq \beta$ in $\mathbf{\Pi}$.

If $\{A, B\}^\# \cap \{\alpha, \beta\}^\# \neq \emptyset$ then $\{A, B\}^\# = \{\alpha, \beta\}^\#$ and $\{\alpha, \beta\}^\# = \{A, B\}^\#$.

Notice that we may instead begin with the assumption that the disjoint union $\mathbf{P} \cup \mathbf{\Pi}$ is nonempty: if either $\mathbf{P}$ or $\mathbf{\Pi}$ is nonempty then so is the other by AXIOM [2] or AXIOM [3]; indeed, each of $\mathbf{P}$ and $\mathbf{\Pi}$ has at least three elements. Notice also that in AXIOM [4] only the (equivalent) inclusions $\{A, B\}^\# \subseteq \{\alpha, \beta\}^\#$ and $\{\alpha, \beta\}^\# \subseteq \{A, B\}^\#$ are new; the reverse inclusions hold already by the mere definition of incidence.

Now, let $A \neq B$ in $\mathbf{P}$ and let $C \in \mathbf{P}$ also. We claim that $\{A, B\}^\# \subseteq C^\# \Leftrightarrow C \in \{A, B\}^\#$: on the one hand, if $\{A, B\}^\# \subseteq C^\#$ then $C \in C^\# \subseteq \{A, B\}^\#$ on account of the Galois properties of incidence; on the other hand, if $C \in \{A, B\}^\#$ and $\pi \in \{A, B\}^\#$ then $C \# \pi$ so that $\pi \in C^\#$ by definition. We may say that C is *collinear* with A and B precisely when either (hence each) of these equivalent conditions is satisfied. The set $\{A, B\}^\#$ comprising all points collinear with A and B is then traditionally a *pencil of points*. A parallel analysis applies to $\alpha \neq \beta$ in $\mathbf{\Pi}$: the set $\{\alpha, \beta\}^\#$ comprising all planes *collinear* with α and β is traditionally a *pencil of planes*.

In order to define a line in our geometry, we combine these pencils. Thus: a *line* is a subset of $\mathbf{P} \cup \mathbf{\Pi}$ having the form $\{A, B\}^\# \cup \{\alpha, \beta\}^\#$ for $A \neq B$ in $\mathbf{P}$ and $\alpha \neq \beta$ in $\mathbf{\Pi}$ such that $\{A, B\}^\# \cap \{\alpha, \beta\}^\# \neq \emptyset$; notice that AXIOM [4] allows us to write this line equally as $\{\alpha, \beta\}^\# \cup \{A, B\}^\#$. For simplicity, we shall denote this line by either AB or $\alpha\beta$ according to convenience. This line may also be described as CD for any $C \neq D$ in $\{\alpha, \beta\}^\#$: indeed, AXIOM [4] gives $\{C, D\}^\# = \{\alpha, \beta\}^\# = \{A, B\}^\#$; likewise, the line may also be described as $\gamma\delta$ for any $\gamma \neq \delta$ in $\{A, B\}^\#$. Elements of $\{A, B\}^\# = \{\alpha, \beta\}^\#$ may be called points of the line AB .

AXIOM [3] says nothing new when $C \in \{A, B\}^\#$: in this case, $\{A, B, C\}^\# = \{A, B\}^\#$ is already nonempty by AXIOM [2]. Accordingly, AXIOM [3] may essentially be replaced by the following theorem together with its counterpart for planes.

Theorem 1. *If the points A, B, C are not collinear then $|\{A, B, C\}^\#| = 1$.*

Proof. AXIOM [3] insists that $\{A, B, C\}^\#$ is nonempty. If $\sigma \neq \tau \in \{A, B, C\}^\#$ then A, B, C are points of the line $\sigma\tau$. $\square$

Otherwise said, three given non-collinear points lie in a unique plane; likewise, three given non-collinear planes pass through a unique point.

Notice that our axioms are invariant under the interchange $\mathbf{P} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{\Pi}$. It follows that if points and planes are interchanged in any theorem, the result is a theorem (whose proof is obtained simply by interchange of points and planes in the proof of the original). This is the principle of *duality*, according to which the elements ‘point’ and ‘plane’ are *dual* while ‘line’ is *self-dual*. For example, we have just seen this principle in action following Theorem 1.

We shall write $\mathbf{L}$ for the set of lines and shall also follow the custom of labelling individual lines by lower case Roman letters: when $\ell \in \mathbf{L}$ we may write $\ell_{\mathbf{P}} = \ell \cap \mathbf{P}$ and $\ell_{\mathbf{\Pi}} = \ell \cap \mathbf{\Pi}$; thus $\ell = \ell_{\mathbf{P}} \cup \ell_{\mathbf{\Pi}}$ where $\ell_{\mathbf{\Pi}} = \ell_{\mathbf{P}}^{\#}$ and $\ell_{\mathbf{P}} = \ell_{\mathbf{\Pi}}^{\#}$. The notion of incidence is extended to include lines according to the following (appropriately dual) definitions. Line ℓ is incident to (or passes through) point P precisely when $P \in \ell$; equivalently, $P \# \ell_{\mathbf{\Pi}}$. Line ℓ is incident to (or lies in) plane π precisely when $\pi \in \ell$; equivalently, $\pi \# \ell_{\mathbf{P}}$. Line ℓ' is incident to (or meets) line ℓ'' precisely when $\ell' \cap \ell'' \neq \emptyset$; we claim that ℓ' and ℓ'' then share both a point and a plane.

Theorem 2. *If ℓ' and ℓ'' are lines, then $\ell'_{\mathbf{P}} \cap \ell''_{\mathbf{P}} \neq \emptyset \Leftrightarrow \ell'_{\mathbf{\Pi}} \cap \ell''_{\mathbf{\Pi}} \neq \emptyset$.*

Proof. If $\ell' = \ell''$ then there is nothing to prove; so suppose $\ell' \neq \ell''$. Let $\ell' = A'B'$ and $\ell'' = A''B''$. Assume $P \in A'B' \cap A''B''$; without loss, say $P \neq A'$ and $P \neq A''$. It follows that $PA' = A'B'$ and $PA'' = A''B''$; it also follows that P, A' and A'' are not collinear, for $A'B' \neq A''B''$. Theorem 1 passes a unique plane π through P, A' and A'' ; thus $\pi \in PA' \cap PA'' = A'B' \cap A''B''$. The converse direction is the dual. $\square$

A closer inspection of the proof shows that if the incident lines ℓ' and ℓ'' are distinct then $|\ell'_{\mathbf{P}} \cap \ell''_{\mathbf{P}}| = 1$ and $|\ell'_{\mathbf{\Pi}} \cap \ell''_{\mathbf{\Pi}}| = 1$: thus, ℓ' and ℓ'' share a unique point and a unique plane.

The next result is neither a surprise nor crucial to our development, but is included for its intrinsic interest.

Theorem 3. *If $B \neq C$ in $\alpha^{\#}$ then $\{B, C\}^{\#\#}$ is a proper subset of $\alpha^{\#}$.*

Proof. $\{B, C\}^{\#\#}$ is a subset of $\alpha^{\#}$ because of the Galois properties of incidence. AXIOM [1] furnishes a point $P \notin \alpha^{\#}$ while AXIOM [2] and AXIOM [4] place a point $S \notin \{B, C\}$ in $\{B, C\}^{\#\#}$. Theorem 1 passes a unique plane π through the non-collinear points P, B and C ; note that $\{P, S, C\}^{\#} = \{P, B, S\}^{\#} = \{\pi\}$ also. AXIOM [2] provides a plane $\sigma \neq \pi$ in $\{P, S\}^{\#}$; from $\alpha \notin P^{\#} \ni \sigma$ it follows that $\alpha \neq \sigma$. AXIOM [2] gives $\{\alpha, \sigma\}^{\#} \subseteq \alpha^{\#}$ at least two points besides S ; none of these can lie in $\{B, C\}^{\#\#}$, for that would force $\sigma = \pi$. $\square$

In other words, if a line ℓ lies in a plane α then α passes not only through each point of ℓ but also through other points. As a complementary result, if the line ℓ does not lie in the plane α , then ℓ and α pass through a unique common point; this is essentially the dual to Theorem 1.

This concludes what we wish to say here about our system itself. In particular, we refrain from further consideration of redundancies among our axioms; we shall not address fully the matter of independence. Regarding the matter of consistency, we now proceed to relate our axiomatic framework for three-dimensional projective space to the traditional Veblen-Young presentation [VY].

Recall that the Veblen-Young approach is based on points and lines, in terms of which planes are defined as follows: if point P and line ℓ are not incident, then the points of the plane $P\ell$ are precisely those points that lie on the lines that join P to points of ℓ ; this is consistent with our framework.

Theorem 4. *Let π be the unique plane through the non-collinear points A, B, C . Then $P \in \pi^{\#}$ precisely when P lies on CD for some point D on AB .*

Proof. $(\Rightarrow)$ Let $P \in \pi^{\#}$: if $P = C$ then there is nothing to do; if $P \neq C$ then AB and CP have a point D in common by Theorem 2. $(\Leftarrow)$ If $D \in \{A, B\}^{\#\#}$ then $\{C, D\}^{\#\#} \subseteq \pi^{\#}$ as in Theorem 3; thus, if P is a point of CD then $P \in \pi^{\#}$. $\square$

Now, we claim that the Veblen-Young axioms of alignment and extension are theorems in our axiomatic framework. In the following discussion we take these Veblen-Young axioms in order, offering a proof within our framework for each of them. Our labelling of these axioms follows [VY]; our phrasing of them differs inessentially from that in [VY].

Consider first the axioms of alignment.

AXIOM (A1): If A and B are distinct points, there is at least one line on both A and B .

[Indeed, A and B lie on the line $AB = \{A, B\}^{\#\#} \cup \{A, B\}^\#$.]

AXIOM (A2): If A and B are distinct points, there is at most one line on both A and B .

[Our definition of lines shows that if also A and B lie on CD then $AB = CD$.]

AXIOM (A3): If A, B, C are points not on the same line, the line joining distinct points D (on the line BC) and E (on the line CA) meets the line AB .

[$\{A, B, C\}^\#$ is a singleton $\{\pi\}$ according to Theorem 1. Note that $D \in \{B, C\}^{\#\#} \subseteq \pi^\#$ and $E \in \{C, A\}^{\#\#} \subseteq \pi^\#$. Thus the lines AB and DE have the plane π in common and so they have a point in common by Theorem 2.]

Consider next the axioms of extension.

AXIOM (E0): There are at least three points on every line.

[This is immediate from AXIOM [2].]

AXIOM (E1): There exists at least one line.

[$\mathbf{P}$ has at least three points; now summon AXIOM (A1).]

AXIOM (E2): All points are not on the same line.

[This follows at once from the next axiom. See also Theorem 3.]

AXIOM (E3): All points are not on the same plane.

[If $\pi \in \mathbf{\Pi}$ is any plane then there exists $P \in \mathbf{P} \setminus \pi^\#$ by AXIOM [1].]

AXIOM (E3'): Any two distinct planes have a line in common.

[If $\alpha \neq \beta$ in $\mathbf{\Pi}$ then $\alpha\beta$ is a line incident to both.]

Thus, each of these Veblen-Young axioms is indeed a theorem of our axiomatic framework. In the opposite direction, we claim that each of our axioms is a theorem of the Veblen-Young axiomatic framework. The detailed verification of this claim is left as an exercise; most of the ingredients already appear as theorems and corollaries in Chapter 1 of [VY]. We also leave as an exercise the pleasure of directly relating the self-dual formulation (with line as the *secondary* element) presented here to the self-dual formulation (with line as the *primary* element) presented in [R].

REFERENCES

- [R] P. L. Robinson, *Projective Space: Lines and Duality*, arXiv 1506.06051 (2015).
- [VY] O. Veblen and J.W. Young, *Projective Geometry*, Volume I, Ginn and Company, Boston (1910).

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA, GAINESVILLE FL 32611 USA
E-mail address: paulr@ufl.edu